

REMARKS/ARGUMENT

Claims 1-10 are pending. Claims 1, 2 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 5,265,833 ("Kim"). Claims 3-5 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim. Claim 6 was objected to as containing certain informalities. Claims 7-10 were withdrawn from consideration.

The Applicant has amended claim 2-10 to correct errors in English grammar and usage, and to correct the form of claims 7-10. These amendments have not resulted in a narrowing of the scope of the claims as previously written. Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and claims by the current amendment.

In view of these amendments, and the remarks set forth below, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding rejection.

I. Claim Objections

Claim 6 was objected as containing certain informalities. The Applicant has amended claim 6 to correct the informalities cited by the Examiner, and requests that the objection be withdrawn.

Claims 7-10 were objected to as being in improper form. The Applicant has amended these claims to place them in proper claim format. It is respectfully requested that the objection to these claims be withdrawn, and that the claims be examined.

A

II. Rejections Under Section 102(e)

Claims 1, 2 and 6 were rejected as being anticipated by Kim. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

Claims 1 and 6 are in independent form, and each requires “a power supply voltage controlling means that controls the power supply voltage for said organic EL display so that said power supply voltage is increased when said amount of said incident light is large, and said power supply voltage is decreased when said amount of said incident light is small.” Claim 2 also requires this limitation by virtue of its dependence on claim 1.

Kim does not disclose or suggest this limitation. In Kim, the *driving voltage* is adjusted depending on the intensity of light of the outside environment. By contrast, claims 1, 2 and 6 each require that the *power supply voltage*, not the driving voltage, be increased when the amount of incident light is large, and decreased when the amount of incident light is small. As a result, Kim does not anticipate claims 1, 2 and 6, and the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for noting that claims 3-5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, the Applicant respectfully

Application No.: 10/020,743

Docket No.: M1909.0158/P158

defers rewriting claims 3-5 until after the Examiner has had the opportunity to consider the Applicant's arguments, set forth above, concerning the allowability of their base claim 1.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

Dated: June 26, 2003

Respectfully submitted

By 
Ian R. Blum

Registration No.: 42,336
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas - 41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400
Attorney for Applicant

IRB/mgs

A